UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,546	08/23/2005	Trevor Ross Suggate	BDW0003-US	2578
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP 875 15th Street, NW			EXAMINER	
			HARTMANN, GARY S	
Washington, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3671	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/519,546	SUGGATE, TREVOR ROSS		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Gary Hartmann	3671		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Ar</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-16 is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2,9 and 17-25 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	e withdrawn from consideration.			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2004 is/al Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 1200 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to be objected 1200 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to be o	re: a) accepted or b) object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the lines are not uniformly thick and well defined. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the copy provided is a poor, barely legible copy. A clear copy of the specification must be provided. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/519,546 Page 3

Art Unit: 3671

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2, 9, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greenwood (U.S. Patent 3,808,757).

Greenwood discloses a deck support having a prefabricated movable member (44) engagable with a corresponding elongated member (42). There is an extension (56, 38) arranged to directly support the deck (Figure 1, for example).

There is a pivotable foot (52).

The method of erecting is deemed to be met.

There are prefabricated handrails (60, 62, 64, 66).

There are folded deck segments (24).

Claims 2, 19-22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gordon (U.S. Patent 5,740,575).

Gordon discloses a deck support having a prefabricated movable member (73) engageable with a corresponding elongated member (60, 62). There is an extension (70, 72) arranged to directly support the deck (Figure 1, for example).

The method of erecting is deemed to be met.

There are folded deck segments (22, 24, 30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood or Gordon, as applied above.

The method is deemed to be met by both of these references. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method as claimed in order to obtain the structures shown in Greenwood and Gordon.

Claims 17 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood or Gordon as applied above, and further in view of Richardson (U.S. Patent 3,788,016).

It is well known to include a roof with a deck structure in order to provide shelter to the deck, as exemplified by Richardson. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the roof of Richardson with the decks of Greenwood or Gordon in order to shelter the deck of Greenwood or Gordon.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood or Gordon as applied above, and further in view of Shomaker (U.S. Patent 6,701,563).

Application/Control Number: 10/519,546 Page 5

Art Unit: 3671

Shomaker teaches the claimed angle to be beneficial in increasing deck strength. For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the claimed angles with Greenwood or Gordon.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Hartmann whose telephone number is 571-272-6989. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gary Hartmann/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3671